

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 5, 11, 27 and 31, and cancel claim 15 without disclaimer of the underlying subject matter or prejudice against future prosecution. Accordingly, claims 5, 9, 11-13, 16-18 and 23-33 remain pending in the application.

**THE EXAMINER IS ONCE AGAIN RESPECTFULLY
REQUESTED TO STATE WHETHER THE DRAWINGS ARE
ACCEPTABLE.**

A new Office Action is respectfully requested, and reexamination and reconsideration of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following Remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102 & 103

The Office Action rejects: claims 5, 9, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Liu et al. U.S. Patent 5,363,287 ("Liu"); and claims 11-12, 17-18, 23-33 in view of Liu in view of Steigerwald et al. U.S. Patent 4,695,934 ("Steigerwald") and further in view of Marson et al. U.S. Patent 5,077,486 ("Marson").

Applicants respectfully traverse all of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 5

Among other things, the resonant converter of claim 5 includes an inverter in series with a capacitive element, an external inductive element, and the primary winding of the transformer.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Liu, nor any combination of Liu and any of the other cited references, includes such an arrangement.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 9

Among other things, in the resonant converter of claim 9 different ratios of a

magnitude of output voltage to number of turns are provided *in respect of associated secondary windings having different winding directions*.

Applicants respectfully submit that Liu does not disclose any resonant converter including such a combination of features. In that regard, it is noted that the magnitude of -12 volts is the same as the magnitude of +12 volts.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is patentable over Liu.

Claims 13 and 16

Claims 13 and 16 depend from claims 5 and 9, respectively, and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 5 and 9.

Claims 11-12, 17-18, and 23-30

Claims 11-12, 17-18, and 23-30 depend variously from claims 5-9. Applicants respectfully submit that the addition and combination of Steigerwald and Marson do not remedy the shortcomings of Liu as set forth above with respect to claims 5 and 9.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-12, 17-18, and 23-30 are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 31-33

Among other things, the resonant converters of claims 31-33 all include a regulating circuit for deriving from each of the multiple outputs a measuring signal for regulating an output voltage of the inverter.

Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of the cited art would produce a resonant converter including such a feature.

The Office Action fairly admits that Liu does not disclose such a feature. Furthermore, the Office Action does not allege that Marson discloses such a feature.

However, the Office Action cites Steigerwald as supposedly disclosing such a feature at col. 3, lines 55-65 and in claim 31.

At the outset, Steigerwald does not even have a claim 31 . . . it only has seven claims!

Furthermore, the text at col. 3, lines 55-65 and FIG. 3 at most indicate the use of one output signal as a measuring signal. They do not disclose or suggest the use

of deriving from each of the multiple outputs a measuring signal for regulating an output voltage of the inverter.

Therefore, no possible combination of Liu, Steigerwald, and Marson could ever produce the resonant converters of claims 31-33.

Furthermore, the Office Action does not cite any reason why it would be believed that "*utilizing the technique taught by Steigerwald et al. and Marson et al.*" would possibly "*increas[e] the efficiency of the power and reduc[e] (!!!) cost effectiveness*" – or even WHY anyone would want to reduce cost effectiveness!

So the proposed combination is respectfully traversed.

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 31-33 are patentable over the cited art.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

The Office Action also rejects claims 5, 9, 11-13, 16-18 and 21-26 on the basis of the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over U.S. Patent 6,721,191 which issued from the very same parent application from which this application claims priority.

Applicants will consider filing an appropriate Terminal Disclaimer after the application is otherwise in condition for allowance such that no further claim amendments are to be entered with respect to the application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 5, 9, 11-13, 16-18 and 23-33, and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these matters.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this reply to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0238 for any

additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17,
particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE & WHITT



By: _____

Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE & WHITT
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone No.: (571) 283.0724
Facsimile No.: (571) 283.0740